DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 615 SO 017 622

AUTHOR Mayton, Daniel M., II; Moore, Richard K.
TITLE Values and Nuclear War Education: Is Teaching a Subversive Activity?
PUB DATE 2 Jul 86
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology (Amsterdam, The Netherlands, July 2, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disarmament; *Dogmatism; *Ethical Instruction; Higher Education; Ideology; Moral Values; National Defense; *Nuclear Warfare; *Peace; Social Values; *Values Education; War

ABSTRACT

Discussion and analysis of the nature of conservative criticisms of nuclear war education and of the peace issue in general are provided in this paper. The general theme of the conservative criticism is that the proponents of such courses are deliberately serving the interests of the Soviet Union by subverting the morality of students away from the traditional American mainstream. The paper also suggests research strategies to empirically address the criticisms raised concerning nuclear war education. Nine students in a nuclear war course at Lewis-Clark State College (Idaho) were administered the Rokeach Value Survey and the Modified World Affairs Questionnaire. The results (which should be interpreted cautiously because of the small sample size) suggest that nuclear war education has had the effect of leading students more toward the "mainstream" of popular thinking, and that although the broad amount of substantive knowledge obtained by these students in economics, physics, biology, strategy, and psychology was significant, the course did not have a major effect on individual values. A two-page list of references and five data tables are appended. (BZ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED274615

Values and Nuclear War Education: Is Teaching a Subversive Activity?[1]

Daniel M. Mayton II
Department of Psychology

Richard K. Moore
Department of Political Science

Lewis Clark State College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Daniel M. Mayton II

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO017622

[1]Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, July 2, 1986, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Running Head: Values and Nuclear War

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Probably the largest circulation periodical in the U.S. is the Reader's Digest which has some 31 million issues sold each month. This conservative periodical has regularly published articles attacking the efforts to bring about a stable peace and the groups supporting those efforts. Articles in Reader's Digest insinuated that the nuclear peace movement is penetrated and dominated by Soviet agents. This insinuation, in turn, has been cited by President Reagan and conservative columnists as "evidence" that there is significant foreign domination of the movement. The presidential and journalistic allegations are then cited as "additional evidence" by U. S. Senators that there is ample "proof" of foreign subversive influence in the nuclear war education effort. On numerous occasions President Reagan has cited these articles to support his policies. Other groups such as the John Birch Society and Accuracy in Academia have specifically attacked nuclear war education efforts. The anti-intellectual nature of these attacks make it all but impossible to establish a dialogue with these groups--who assume that analysis of the economics, technology, ethics, strategies, and psychology of nuclear war is, ipso facto, subversive.

The first purpose of this paper is to provide some discussion and analysis of the nature of conservative criticisms of nuclear war education and of the peace issue, in general. The general thrust of the conservative criticism is that the proponents of such courses are deliberately serving the interests of the Soviet Union by subverting the morality of students away from the traditional American mainstream or subverting the defenses of the United States and our allies to reduce our national security and world influence. The second purpose of this paper is to suggest research strategies to empirically address the criticisms

raised concerning nuclear war education. The proposed strategies are couched in terms of values and some preliminary pilot study data is provided based on the authors' course on nuclear war.

NATURE OF CONSERVATIVE CRITICISM

From the mid-1950's through the late 1970's, public concern about nuclear war threats and policy have been relatively muted. With the advent of the Reagan administration, there was a massive reawakening of concern and a concommitant demand for both action and information concerning nuclear issues. A demand for dialogue with policy-makers, a search for alternatives to the status quo, and a hunger for accurate, disinterested information on the subject arose simultaneously throughout the United States. This broad popular concern paralleled similar concerns that had arisen earlier in Europe. Both the "military establishment" and the conservative constituency of the status quo seem to have been caught largely unprepared for this attack on what they feel is the only viable policy option (i.e., more of the same).

Rather than confront this "new" public issue dispassionately, these conservative forces chose to attack the personalities and motivation of those raising these disturbing questions. Ostensibly, the most disturbing thing in the whole movement was the call for a nuclear freeze. This option was regarded as tantamount to unilateral disarmament, in the public statements of the conservative force. Memories of Neville Chamberlain and "appeasement" were resurrected. "Peace through Strength" was simplistically juxtaposed against a mindless, pacifistic Nuclear Freeze. Black and white. Right and wrong. Strength and subervision.

By inaccurately describing one aspect of the public's growing concern over the nuclear threat and playing on the American public's distrust of the Soviet Union, the entire issue could be defeated and ignored (American Security Council Foundation, 1982).

By neatly dicotomizing a complex movement and issue using McCarthy tactics of the 1950's, the conservatives hoped to lay the entire issue to rest. Western Goals, a publishing association closely connected to the John Birch Society, brought forth a book entitled, The War Called Peace: The Soviet Peace Offensive. This work inventoried every peace activist group of any stature in the U.S. In addition, it included a great many groups which were not in the peace movement or were non-partisan, educational groups (Western Goals, 1982). The tactic of "guilt by association" was unhesitatingly used. Those who questioned the propriety of uncritical acceptance of the status quo were characterized as being, at best, gullible and naive. At worst, they were the deliberate agents of a hostile foreign power.

The great conservative reaction to the nuclear threat issue peaked around 1984. Since that time, a new group has emerged to attack nuclear war education efforts at colleges and universities in the U.S. Accuracy in Academia has taken upon itself the task of entering classrooms and lecture halls to denounce professors who suggest alternatives to the status quo. Although the threat to academia posed by this group is slight, its existence and tactics are somewhat sobering (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1985).

Character assassination, guilt by association, and gross simplification of the issues are the stock in trade of those opposed to nuclear war education. These frightened people see efforts providing

alternative perspectives as positively subversive. "Subversion" is a term which is little used in the social and behavioral sciences as it is rather more a legal term than a scientific one. Further, it has a powerful negative connotation which has a tendency to slant any empirical investigation. With respect to the nuclear threat, "subversion" can refer to two aspects. First, it can refer to subtle erosion and destruction of a moral code. Second, it can refer to the internal decay of an institutional arrangement within society, or to society, itself. Taking a moral code to be a value system, subversion of a moral code would result from the radical rearrangement of the priorities of values within that system. Widespread subversion of a moral code would, presumably, result in the broader institutional effects of the second effort.

Insofar as students would tend to be critical of the current institutions and policies (and their proponents) responsible for preventing war through nuclear/military deterrence, they would be fairly termed "subversive" to the status quo. Those who would argue for a foreign policy that relies on something in addition to (or in lieu of) traditional national military establishments as a means to achieving a stable peace, would fit in this category. In contrast, those who would strengthen the status quo with respect to peacekeeping (modernize and enlarge the armed forces) as a means to an end would be regarded as patriotic.

In both cases relative effectiveness is not the question. Those who support a status quo solution to the problem of nuclear threat seem to do so to the exclusion of all other options. In fact, rather than seeing national security achieved through the military establishment as means to

world peace, they have come to regard "national security" as an end, in itself. Despite rhetoric to the contrary, many national security advocates are merely advancing particularistic bureaucratic advantage with little or no concern for long-term consequences or effectiveness.

The effort to educate a large segment of the general public to the threat and consequences of nuclear war, whether in the theater or the classroom, has evoked charges ranging from naivete to treason. Ill-founded as those charges may be, it seems useful to discuss some of the effects we have found in students who have completed courses in nuclear war offered by the authors.

VALUE DIMENSIONS OF SUBVERSION

If nuclear war education is, in fact, a subversive activity, students' values must be modified in ways which would put them at odds with their peers and the general public. A value is an enduring prescriptive or proscriptive belief that a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence is preferred to another mode of conduct or end-state (Rokeach, 1973). Values are multifaceted standards which serve to maintain and enhance self-esteem by guiding individual conduct. Rokeach (1973) has defined and developed measurement devices for assessing terminal values which are the personal and social end states of existence for which people strive and instrumental values which are the personally and socially preferred modes of conduct. The Rokeach Value Survey requires respondents to rank 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values in terms of the importance of each as guiding principles in their life. An individual's value system is an organized configuration of his

or her values along the continuum of relative importance. Thus changes in a value system involve a reordering of priorities given to specific values.

Two terminal values of particular relevance to the issue of nuclear war education are a world at peace (free of war and conflict) and national security (protection from attack). Moral values which are a type of instrumental value are also very germane to the issue of nuclear war education. These moral instrumental values, include the values which, when violated, arouse feelings of guilt or pangs on conscience for wrong doing. These values include ambitiious, broadminded, courageous, forgiving, honest, obedient, polite and responsible.

The value placed on a world at peace has been very high in the general American population. In representative national samples in the United States, a world at peace was ranked as the highest value in 1968 and 1971 (Rokeach, 1979). In 1974 and 1981, a world at peace was ranked as the second highest terminal value in representative American national samples (Inglehart, 1985). Rokeach (1973) has noted that college students generally rank a world at peace as having a much lower priority. He described a developmental pattern in which eleven to seventeen year olds rank a world at peace as a top priority, college students rank a world at peace as a 10 and then older Americans again rank a world at peace at the top of the terminal value hierarchy. The moderate priority placed on the world at peace by college students was also noted to exist in Australian and Canadian samples (Rokeach, 1973).

The value placed on national security has been in the middle third of the terminal value hierarchy of the general American population. In 1968, 1971, 1974, and 1981 representative national samples in the United

States, national security was ranked 12, 8, 13 and 11, respectively (Inglehart, 1985). Developmentally, Rokeach (1973) noted that national security increases gradually in importance between the ages of eleven and fifteen, then it drops sharply to sixteenth or seventeenth for 17 year olds and college students. With each succeeding decade, national security gradually increases in importance to fourth in sixty-year-olds before dropping back down to the middle third of the hierarchy. Australian and Canadian samples of college students also were shown to rank national security very low at 17 (Rokeach, 1973).

The moral instrumental values of ambitious (hard-working, aspiring), broadminded (open-minded), courageous (standing up for your beliefs), forgiving (willing to pardon others), honest (sincere, truthful) and responsible (dependable, reliable) were in the top third of the typical American's value hierarchy in both 1968 and 1971 national samples (Rokeach, 1979). The instrumental values of obedient (dutiful, respectful) and polite (courteous, well-mannered) were ranked in the bottom third within the same national samples. The moral values of being broadminded, honest and responsible were also in the top third of American, Australian and Canadian college students value hierarchies. The moral values of being obedient and polite also fall in the bottom third of the instrumental value hierarchies of these same three groups. While American and Australian college students ranked ambitious in the top third, Canadian college students placed this value in the middle of their hierarchy. All three college samples ranked courageous and forgiving in the middle of their hierarchies (Rokeach, 1973).

Rokeach (1973, 1979) has described and tested empirically a procedure for changing values. The self-confrontation procedure for

long-term value change involves making people aware of an inconsistency between their values and their self-conceptions. The arousal of this specific type of self-dissatisfaction using value feedback precipitates a reevaluation of value priorities to remove the contradiction between their value hierarchy and their self-concept. With the value change subsequent changes in value-related attitudes and behavior are observed (e.g., Ball-Rokeach, Rokeach, Grube 1984).

The changing of values raises many ethical issues (Raven and Rubin, 1983). While the values of equality, a world of beauty, self-controlled, sense of accomplishment and others have been induced to undergo long-term change using self-confrontation experimental procedures, Rokeach and Grube (1979) report evidence that values can not be manipulated arbitrarily. In their studies target value priorities increased when participants indicated a willingness to change in that direction. Regarding the value of a world at peace, college student participants were classified into three groups. High, middle and low groups ranked a world at peace in the top, middle or bottom third of their terminal hierarchy. A total of 96, 93 and 62 percent of the participants in the high, middle and low groups, respectively, reported they would increase a world at peace in their hierarchy if they could. A total of 96, 93 and 75 percent in the high, middle and low groups, respectively, reported they would resist attempts to decrease the importance of a world at peace. Participants were also classified into high, middle and low groups based on their ranking of national security in the top, middle or bottom third of their terminal value hierarchy. A total of 17, 53 and 17 percent in the high, middle and low groups, respectively, reported they would increase the importance of national security if they could, while

67, 64 and 26 percent respectively would oppose a decrease in this value's priority. Thus, a world at peace is much more likely to change by moving higher in the value hierarchy than the value of national security. Also, Rokeach and Grube's (1979) undirectional hypothesis implies the value of a world at peace is not likely to decrease in its priority.

RESEARCH STRATEGIES TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF NUCLEAR WAR EDUCATION

Studies designed to address the criticisms of nuclear war education need to include values as dependent measures along with reliable and valid assessments of attitudes. While the impact of components of nuclear war courses might be assessed using experimental designs, the full impact of an entire quarter or semester-long course may be very different than the sum of its component parts. The assessment of course impact by experimental designs is also problematic because students self-select their courses and cannot be randomly assigned. Perhaps half of those students selecting a nuclear war course during a term could be randomly identified and asked to take the course in a subsequent term. Thus a comparable control group would be created. Besides the logistical and ethical problems which would need to be dealt with using this approach, college administrators concerned with FTE might balk at this approach. Therefore, quasi-experimental designs seem to be the advisable approach to researching this issue for reasons of generalizibility and practical concerns.

Among the many quasi-experimental designs which might be utilized to assess the impact of nuclear war courses, variations in the time-series

designs and separate-sample pretest-posttest designs (Campbell and Stanley, 1963) seem to be particularly promising. In conjunction with each of the above types of designs the measurement of nuclear war attitudes and values along with demographic characteristics in the general student population would allow for the development of a matched control group for the students in the nuclear war courses. While not a classic control group in a strict sense, this group of cohorts would serve as an important point of comparison. Another critical issue would be the inclusion of multiple posttests spread out over at least a year's time after the course has been completed. Posttests immediately after the conclusion of the course might overlook changes in attitudes and values which are the result of the sleeper effect (Cook, Gruder, Hennigan and Flay, 1979) and overestimate the impact which dissipates quickly after final examinations.

SOME VALUE-NUCLEAR WAR EDUCATION PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Course Content

A perusal of nuclear war course syllabi cataloged by United Campuses to Prevent Nuclear War makes it obvious that nuclear war education exists in many different academic departments and is structured in many different ways. The Lewis Clark State College (LCSC) course which was studied here was designed as a general interdisciplinary survey of issues related to nuclear war. The history of the development of nuclear weapons, delivery systems and other technological advancements which have occurred to the present were discussed. The political and military

aspects of U. S. and Soviet posturing and their strategies toward waging nuclear war were presented along with their respective civil defense strategies. The medical, environmental and societal consequences of a major super power nuclear exchange were also presented. The course considered the impact that the possibility of nuclear war has had from psychological, economic, religious, and moral perspectives. Presentations of representative advocacy groups concerning nuclear issues were made to help students formulate their own position concerning how nuclear war can best be prevented. The assignments, discussions and presentations focused on the ethical implications of the dominant points of view regarding nuclear war issues.

Procedures

The original intent of this study was to use the separate-sample pretest-posttest design along with an LCSC student comparison group to assess the impact of the course. Due to low enrollment it was not possible to use this design as anticipated. Students in the LCSC nuclear war course were administered the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) and the Modified World Affairs Questionnaire (MWAQ) during the first class period and the last class period. A total of only 9 students completed the pretest and the posttest. Because of this extremely small sample size the results to follow should be interpreted very cautiously at the level of a pilot study.

The MWAQ is a 23 item questionnaire developed and analyzed by Mayton (1984, 1986). The five subscales of the MWAQ are labeled civil defense, escalation, nuclear war outcome, probability/worry and patriotic with

4,3, 4, 5 and 2 items respectively assessing each area. Higher scores on the civil defense subscale reflect beliefs in a more effective civil defense system. High scores on the escalation subscale indicate a strong resolve to use military force at the highest levels to win any conflict. High nuclear war outcome scores are reflective of more destructive views of the consequences of a nuclear war. High scores for the probability/worry subscales indicate nuclear war is more probable and that the respondent thinks about nuclear war more often, is more worried about it and has more nightmares concerning nuclear war. High patriotic subscale scores reflect a greater need to combat the communist threat with more patriotism.

Results

Five dependent t tests were completed for the five MWAQ subscale pretest and posttest scores. None reached statistical significance at the .05 level. A total of 36 dependent t tests were computed for the 18 terminal values and the 18 instrumental values of the RVS pretest and posttest rankings. Only two values changed at a statistically significant level which is about what would be expected based on chance. Therefore, these two differences were disregarded as they could easily be Type I errors.

The composite rank order of the terminal values for the pretest and posttest of the LCSC nuclear war class are presented in Table 1. Adjacent to these two sets of ranks are the composite rank orders of a Spring 1985 sampling of LCSC students and a 1981 national sample of the general American public. For the nuclear war class all values in the

top, middle and bottom third of the hierarchy at the time of the pretest remained in that relative position at the time of the posttest. A comparison of the nuclear war class values and the values of the LCSC sample and the American public result in several noteworthy observations. The nuclear war class student ranks equality very high compared to the other samples which indicates a more liberal orientation than other college students and the general adult population. The LCSC student and the American adult rank family security as a top value whereas the nuclear war student places this value closer to the middle of their hierarchy. The value of a world at peace is second in importance for the general American population, however, the LCSC student sample as well as the nuclear war student ranked it in the middle of their hierarchy. Salvation is ranked last for the nuclear war student whereas the LCSC student and the general population place this value nearer to the middle.

Insert Table 1 about here

The composite rank orders of the instrumental values for the pretest and posttest of the LCSC nuclear war class are presented in Table 2. Adjacent to these two sets of ranks are the composite rank orders of a 1968 college student sample and a Spring 1985 sampling of LCSC students. (A recent national sample of the American public was not located at this time.) While movement was noted in composite value rankings to place less importance on logical and capable and more on self-controlled, the overwhelming observation is the relative stability from the pretest to the posttest in the nuclear war students. In all three instances this

movement results in value priorities which are more like the two general college student samples. Thus regression effects may be just as reasonable of an explanation of change as the nuclear war course itself. A comparison of the nuclear war class values and the two general college student samples indicates relatively higher value placed on intellectual and imaginative for the nuclear war student. The nuclear war student ranks helpful and forgiving lower in their instrumental hierarchy than their LCSC peers.

Insert Table 2 about here

The similarity between the total value hierarchies of the groups represented in Tables 1 and 2 can be computed by a Spearman rho coefficient using composite rank order data as indicated by Rokeach (1973, 1975). The Spearman rho coefficients are presented in Table 3 with the terminal value similarity figures above the diagonal and the instrumental figures below it. The coefficients between pretest and posttest rankings for both terminal and instrumental values are very high and indicate minimal value system change during the nuclear war course. The changes between the coefficients for pretest and the American public sample and the posttest and the American public sample indicate stronger terminal value similarity after taking the course than before. For the instrumental values, nuclear war students posttest ranks are more similar (higher coefficients) to the other two college samples than they were the pretest ranks.

Insert Table 3 about here

The values of a world at peace and national security do seem to be related to attitudes toward nuclear war. The correlation coefficients between these two values and the MWAQ subscales are presented in Table 4. The world at peace ranking correlated significantly with the civil defense, escalation and patriotic subscales. The national security ranking correlated significantly with the patriotic subscale score. Persons who rank a world at peace as a high priority tend to view civil defense as less effective, to have less resolve to use military force at the highest levels to win a conflict, and to have a lesser need to combat the communist threat with more patriotism. Persons who rank national security as a high priority have a greater need to combat the communist threat with more patriotism.

Insert Table 4 about here

The relationship between the values of a world at peace and national security and policy issues was assessed using a separate college student sample and a separate attitudinal scale. Profreeze or more liberal policy toward nuclear war issues was assessed by summing the evaluative responses to the terms bilateral nuclear freeze, peaceful coexistence, arms control, international cooperation, military parity and no first use of nuclear weapons. Prostrength or more conservative policy toward

nuclear war issues was assessed by summing the evaluative responses to the terms military superiority, deterrence, military foreign aid, national security and nuclear retaliation. The correlations between the profreeze and prostrength policy scales and the values of a world at peace and national security are also presented in Table 4. Only the correlation between a world at peace and profreeze attitudes reached statistically significant levels. Persons who rank a world at peace as a high priority tend to evaluate profreeze policy issues more positively.

The correlation coefficients between the rankings of seven moral instrumental values and the five MWAQ subscales are presented in Table 5. Ten of the thirty-five correlations reached statistical significance at least at the .05 level. Persons who viewed civil defense as more effective tended to place higher priority on being honest and polite. College respondents who possessed a stronger resolve to use military force at the highest levels to win any conflict tended to put a higher priority on being responsible along with lower priorities on being broadminded and forgiving. Respondents who viewed nuclear war as more destructive tended to value being obedient less and being ambitious more. College respondents who reported greater needs to combat the communist threat with more patriotism tended to put more priority on being honest and polite and less on being broadminded.

Insert Table 5 about here

CONCLUSION

Available evidence suggests that nuclear war education has something less than a profound effect on the value systems of those exposed to it. Further, the actual impact of such education seems to be of less concern to its critics than its availability. "When decision-makers become overly concerned with enemies, actual or imagined, they tend to lose sight of goals and fail to establish equitable or appropriate priorities in balancing interests" (Finlay, 1967).

Tampering with the traditional approach to the nuclear threat, even to the extent of objectively discussing it, evokes a chilling response from advocates of the status quo that is out of all proportion to the demonstrable effects of that discussion. The question of subversion under these circumstances remains unanswered. Neither the intent or the effect of nuclear education can reasonably be termed "subversive." Yet, both the traditional approach to national security (an end in itself) and the beneficiaries of this approach in the military establishment are threatened with subversion by an increased, rational discussion of the realities of the nuclear threat.

Our evidence suggests that nuclear war education has had the effect of leading students more toward the "mainstream" of popular thinking. Although the broad amount of substantive knowledge obtained by these students in economics, physics, biology, strategy, and psychology was significant, the effects of the course on the value system could hardly be termed "subversive."

REFERENCES

American Security Council Foundation (1982) Countdown for America. Boston, Virginia.

Ball-Rokeach, S.; Rokeach, M.; Grube, J. (1984) The great American values test. New York: Free Press.

Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. (1963) Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Chavez, L. (1983) Teaching about nuclear war, American Educator, Fall, pp. 16-21.

Clark, E.W. (Ed) (1983) Americanist issues: The peace and nuclear freeze campaigns. Belmont, MA: American Opinion, Inc.

Cook, T.D.; Gruder, C.L.; Hennigan, K.M.; & Flay, B.R. (1979) History of the sleeper effect: Some logical pitfalls in accepting the null hypothesis. Pyschological Bulletin, 86, 662-679.

Finlay, D.J., Holsti, O.R., & Fagen, R.R. (1967) Enemies in politics. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.

Griffith, W.E. (1982, June) Ban whose bomb? Reader's Digest, pp. 65-8.

Heller, S. (1985) Chilling effect feared at Arizona State University from monitoring by Accuracy in Academia, The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 18, pp. 19, 30.

Inglehart, R. (1985) Aggregate stability and individual-level flux in mass belief systems: The level of analysis paradox. The American Political Science Review, 79, 97-116.

Mayton, D.M. (1984) The day after: A quasi-experimental study of its

impact. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada. (ERIC Document #ED 257 697)

Mayton, D.M. (1986) The measurement of nuclear war attitudes: Methods and concerns. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Seattle, Washington.

McManus, J.F. (1982) What about nuclear madness? John Birch Society Bulletin.

Raven, B. & Rubin, J. (1983) Social psychology (2nd ed), New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rees, H. (Ed) (1982) The war called peace: The Soviet peace offensive, Alexandria, VA: Western Goals, Inc.

Rokeach, M. (1973) The nature of human values. New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. (1975) Long-term value change initiated by computer feedback. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32(3), 467-476.

Rokeach, M. (ed) (1979) Understanding human values. New York: Free Press.

Rokeach, M. & Grube, J. (1979) Can values be manipulated arbitrarily? In M. Rokeach (ed) Understanding human values. New York: Free Press, p. 241-256.

Table 1

Composite Rank Orders of Terminal Values for Nuclear War Class and Two Comparison Groups

Terminal Value	Nuclear War Class (Sp 86) Pre	Nuclear War Class (Sp 86) Post	LCSC Students Sp 85	American Public 1981 [1]
SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)	1	4	3	4
TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)	2	6	5	10
FREEDOM (independence, free choice)	3	3	2	3
HEALTH (physical and mental well being)[2]	4	1	4	5
WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)	5	2	6	6
EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)	6	5	15	12
INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)	7	12	7	13
FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)	8	7	1	1
A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting content)	9	10	8	7
MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)	10	8	9	14
A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)	11	9	10	2
AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)	12	11	13	15
A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)	13	14	11	8
PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)	14	15	14	17
A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)	15	13	17	16
SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)	16	16	16	18
NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)	17	17	18	11
SALVATION (saved, eternal life)	18	18	12	9

[1] Inglehart (1985) p110

[2] HAPPINESS (contentedness) was used in the 1985 and 1981 samples in the place of HEALTH.

Table 2

Composite Rank Orders of Instrumental Values for Nuclear War Class and Two Comparison Groups

Instrumental Value	Nuclear War Class (Sp 86) Pre	Nuclear War Class (Sp 86) Post	College[1] 1968	LCSC College 1985
INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)	1	2	9	15
RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)	2	3	2	2
HONEST (sincere, truthful)	3	1	1	1
LOGICAL (consistent, rational)	4	10	12	16
BROADMINDED (open-minded)	5	4	3	7
INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)	6	6	6	5
LOVING (affectionate, tender)	7	9	5	3
CAPABLE (competent, affective)	8	13	10	12
AMBITIOUS (hard working, aspiring)	9	7	4	8
IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)	10	8	14	17
HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)	11	11	13	6
COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)	12	12	7	14
SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-disciplined)	13	5	8	9
LOYAL (faithful to one's friends, group)[2]	14	16	15	11
FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)	15	14	11	4
POLITE (courteous, well mannered)	16	15	16	10
CLEAN (neat, tidy)	17	17	17	13
OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)	18	18	18	18

[1]Rokeach (1973) p77

[2]The 1968 and 1985 samples ranked CHEERFUL in place of LOYAL.

Table 3

Value System Similarity as Measured by Spearman Rho[1]

	Nuclear War Class (Sp 86) Pre	Nuclear War Class (Sp 86) Post	LCSC Students 1985	American Public 1981
Nuclear War Class Pretest	---	.91	.80	.52
Nuclear War Class Posttest	.85	---	.73	.57
LCSC College Students 1985	.32	.44	---	.74
College Students 1968	.74	.82	.67	---

[1]Terminal value system coefficients are above the diagonal and instrumental value system coefficients are below the diagonal.

Table 4

Intercorrelations Between Nuclear War Attitudes and

Selected Terminal Values

Nuclear War Attitude	Terminal Values	
	A World at Peace	National Security
MWAQ Scales[1]		
Civil Defense	.44*	-.42
Escalation	.68**	-.43
Nuclear War Outcome	-.37	.34
Probability/Worry	-.11	-.13
Patriotic	.49*	-.52*
Policy Scales[2]		
Profreeze	-.30*	.09
Prostrength	.01	-.14

[1]Intercorrelations between MWAQ scales and values based on sample of 21 upper division LCSC college students during Spring Semester 1986.

[2]Intercorrelation between policy scales and values based on a sample of 58 LCSC college students during Spring Semester 1985.

*significant at .05 level
**significant at .01 level

Table 5

Intercorrelations Between Nuclear War Attitudes and Moral Instrumental Values[1]

Moral Instrumental Values	MWAQ Scales				
	Civil Defense	Escalation	Nuclear War Outcome	Probability/ Worry	Patriotic
Ambitious	.19	-.03	-.54*	.18	-.17
Broadminded	.20	.45*	-.27	-.05	.63**
Forgiving	.10	.50*	-.39	-.30	.25
Honest	-.44*	-.09	.15	-.15	-.54*
Obedient	-.23	-.02	.44*	.41	-.32
Polite	-.52*	-.13	.40	-.22	-.48*
Responsible	-.30	-.51*	-.04	.07	-.31

[1]Intercorrelations between MWAQ scales and values based on sample of 21 upper division LCSC college students during Spring Semester 1986.

*significant at the .05 level
**significant at the .01 level